

FIG. 4. In view of the foregoing, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

At paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure. The Examiner stated that the descriptions of Fig. 3a, Fig. 3b, Fig. 3c, and Fig. 4 are not shown in the Brief Description Section. Applicants have amended the specification to include a brief description of these drawings. Applicants have further amended the specification in view of the Examiner's other objections to the specification. Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn in view of the amendments.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

At Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-19 under the second paragraph of § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Claims 9, 12, 15, 16, and 18 have been amended. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Applicants believe that the amendments have overcome the Examiner's rejections. It is respectfully asserted that the rejections under the second paragraph of § 112 be withdrawn.

Applicants note that the amendments to the claims made to overcome the Examiner's rejections in paragraph 4 of the Office Action are not made to overcome art, and so should not be construed in a limiting manner.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

At paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,218 to Colli. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 16 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 16 to recite the feature of an "analog active feedback circuit." Applicants respectfully submit that Colli does not disclose, recognize, or imply the feature of an "analog active feedback circuit." Therefore, Colli does not anticipate claims 1, 9, and 16. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit

A

that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection be withdrawn because amended claims 1, 9, and 16 (and therefore claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 14-16 which are dependent from claims 1 and 9) recite the feature of an "analog active feedback circuit" which is not disclosed, recognized or implied by Colli.

With respect to claim 20, the claimed method of having a "hold period" is not disclosed, disclosed, recognized, or implied by Colli. Q4a and Q2b of Colli are designed to either charge or discharge. They never are in a hold mode. There is no teaching in Colli of any hold mode as recited in claim 20. For example, Figures 3 and 7 of Colli show charging and discharging to saturation. However, if there were a hold mode in Colli, there would be the ability to level the waveform off at mid-charge. There is no such hold mode. Colli goes to limits (top or bottom) every time. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection be withdrawn because claim 20 (and therefore claim 21 which is respectively dependent thereon) recite the feature a hold mode which is not disclosed, recognized or implied by Colli.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Colli et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 for reasons unnecessary to detail at this time because this claim depends from claim 1 and thereby incorporates the patentably distinguishing features of claim 1 as noted above.

At paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 7, 13, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Colli in view of Diller. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 7, 13, and 19 for reasons unnecessary to detail at this time because these claims depend from claims 1, 9, and 16 respectively and thereby incorporate the patentably distinguishing features of claims 1, 9, and 16 as noted above.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

A

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS AS BEING DEPENDENT ON A REJECTED CLAIM

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3, 10, and 18 are merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form (and rewritten to overcome any § 112 rejections) including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. At this time and in view of Applicants' above remarks concerning the patentability of the base claims, Applicants have not rewritten these claims in independent form. However, Applicant wishes to reserve all rights related to these claims and respectfully requests that objections to any of these claims 3, 10, and 18 be withdrawn in view of the above.

Other features of the claims are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. Discussion of these features is believed to be unnecessary at this time, however, in view of the basic differences pointed out above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above discussion and amendments, Applicants believe that the claims as now amended are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' attorney below at (612) 371-5305.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
3100 Norwest Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-5300

Dated: 9/23/99

By: 

Robert J. Glance
Reg. No. 40,620

A